

10, 16, 17, 33, 34, 37, 43, 44 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Deker in view of Lions '632. Claims 18-27 are rejected for the same reasons applied to Claims 1-10, respectively. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention as set forth in representative Claim 1 relates to a navigational system comprised of a display device that includes a graphical display portion and a textual display portion, and logic for controlling the display device. As claimed, the logic presents a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan in the textual display portion while, at the same time, the original flight plan is graphically displayed.

As previously discussed, the navigational system in Deker includes a display screen 11 divided into a graphical display portion 27 and a textual display portion 28. As understood, Deker is capable of providing alternate flight plan solutions to a pilot in response to an "event" or an emergency. The Office Action continues to assert that Deker is capable of presenting a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan in the textual display portion 28 while also presenting a graphical display of the original flight plan in the graphical display portion 27, citing three different portions of the Deker patent.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Deker does not provide a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan as set forth in Applicants' claimed invention. As understood by Applicants, in each of the portions in Deker cited in the Office Action, i.e., column 4, lines 36-65; column 7, lines 34-39; and column 8, lines 7-19, the textual window 28 only displays "significant parameters" of the flight plans and not the flight plans themselves. Such "parameters" are disclosed as relating to, for example, the distance to be traveled, the amount of time required, the volume of fuel remaining at the destination, etc. (see column 4, lines 43-49). Displaying these parameters is not

the same as displaying flight plans. The only reference to be providing a textual display of the active flight plan and an alternative flight plan is when the pilot presses the button COMPARE FLPN, which provides a full screen display of a comparative table 32 (see column 6, line 66 through column 7, line 6). By providing the full screen display, there is no graphic window 27. It is submitted, therefore, that Deker is simply not capable of presenting a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan while simultaneously presenting a graphical display of the original flight plan.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Deker. The remaining independent claims are also patentably distinct from Deker.

Independent Claim 11 relates to a navigational system that includes, among other features, logic means for simultaneously, textually displaying an original flight plan and a modified flight plan in the textual portion while the original flight plan is graphically displayed.

Claim 18 relates to a method of displaying a flight plan and includes the steps of simultaneously displaying a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan in the textual display portion while the original flight plan is graphically displayed.

Claim 28 relates to a computer executable code for executing the step of simultaneously displaying a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan while graphically displaying the original flight plan.

Claim 38 relates to a navigational system that includes logic that simultaneously presents a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan on a display device while graphically displaying the original flight plan.

Claims 11, 18, 28 and 38 are submitted to be patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Lastly, Claim 39 relates to a navigational system that includes logic for simultaneously presenting a textual display of comparative data for an original flight plan and a modified flight plan on the display device while the original flight plan is graphically displayed. It is also submitted that this feature is missing in Deker.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

The secondary citation to Lions relates to a navigation system and was cited for its teaching of removing textual display waypoints on the original flight plan. Lions fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Deker as discussed above with respect to Applicants' independent claims.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the proposed combination of Deker and Lions, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

It is submitted, therefore, that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 1, 11, 18, 28, 38 and 39 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-27, 29-37 and 40-51 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to Honeywell's address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicants  
Scott D. Malpede  
Registration No. 32,533

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.  
Law Department  
101 Columbia Road  
P.O. Box 2245  
Morristown, New Jersey 07962-2245

SDM\mm

DC\_MAIN 161733v1